

Application No.: 10/008235

Case No.: 55393US011

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 64 are pending. Claims 1 to 7 and 28 to 63 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 8, 26, 27, and 64 were previously amended.

Claims 8-27 and 64 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 99/29787. Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because, at the very least, the reference does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of independent claims 8 and 64. Claims 8 and 64 recite that the reactive diluent comprises a particular combination of components:

- a. a high Tg component,
- b. 0.1 to 50 weight percent of an adhesion promoting component comprising at least one of a heterocyclic monomer and/or a monomer comprising a pendant alkoxyated moiety,
- c. at least one multifunctional monomer, and
- d. no more than about 10 weight percent of an alkoxyated monomer comprising main-chain alkoxyated functionality.

WO 99/29787 does teach a reactive liquid material comprising both monofunctional and difunctional material and that mixtures of each may be used. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that a wide variety of materials are listed (pages 9-11) with little or no guidance as to how to choose combinations and/or amounts.

As stated by the Examiner, isobornyl acrylate, tetrahydrofurfuryl acrylate, and 2-(2-ethoxyethoxy)ethyl (meth)acrylate are mentioned in the reference. There is no teaching or motivation, however, to combine isobornyl acrylate (a high Tg component) with either tetrahydrofurfuryl acrylate or 2-(2-ethoxyethoxy)ethyl (meth)acrylate (both adhesion promoting components). For example, if a resultant cured material were lacking in hardness or abrasion resistance, there is no teaching or suggestion to use isobornyl acrylate as there is in the present application (p. 14, lines 1-6). For another example, if a resultant cured material were lacking in adhesion to a desired receiving substrate, there is no teaching or suggestion to use either tetrahydrofurfuryl acrylate or 2-(2-ethoxyethoxy)ethyl (meth)acrylate.

Even if there is teaching or suggestion to make the particular combinations, there is still no teaching or suggestion to limit tetrahydrofurfuryl acrylate and 2-(2-ethoxyethoxy)ethyl (meth)acrylate to 0.1 to 50 weight percent of a reactive diluent.

Application No.: 10/008235

Case No.: 55393US011

With regard to claim 11, WO 99/29787 does not teach or suggest that the oligo/resin be aliphatic.

With regard to claims 14 and 26, WO 99/29787 does not teach or suggest particular ratios of components.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-27 and 64.

Double Patenting

Claims 8-27 and 64 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting. Applicant respectfully defers response to this rejection given the amendments to the claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

2-23-06
Date

By: EA Gallo
Elizabeth A. Gallo, Ph.D., Reg. No.: 51,716
Telephone No.: 651-733-9608

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833